

Fast Algorithm for Robust Subspace Recovery

Gilad Lerman
Department of Mathematics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
lerman@umn.edu

Tyler Maunu
Department of Mathematics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
maun0021@umn.edu

Abstract

This paper presents a fast algorithm for robust subspace recovery. The datasets considered include points drawn around a low-dimensional subspace of a higher dimensional ambient space, and a possibly large portion of points that do not lie nearby this subspace. The proposed algorithm, which we refer to as Fast Median Subspace (FMS), is designed to robustly determine the underlying subspace of such datasets, while having lower computational complexity than existing methods. Numerical experiments on synthetic and real data demonstrate its competitive speed and accuracy.

1 Introduction

In the modern age, data is collected in increasingly higher dimensions and massive quantities. An important method for analyzing large, high-dimensional data involves modeling it by a low-dimensional subspace. By projecting the data on this subspace, one can significantly reduce the dimension of the data while capturing its most significant information. Classically, this is the problem of principal component analysis (PCA) that finds the subspace of maximum variance. It is efficiently implemented for moderate-size data by using the singular value decomposition (SVD) of the data matrix. For larger data, recently-developed random SVD methods have been proved to be stable, accurate and fast [12].

Despite the impressive progress with effective algorithms for PCA, the underlying idea of PCA is completely useless when the data is corrupted. Here we follow an “inliers-outliers” corruption model. More precisely, we assume that some of the data points (the inliers) are sampled around a d -dimensional subspace, whereas, the rest of them (the outliers) are sampled from a different (and possibly arbitrary) model. The problem of Robust Subspace Recovery (RSR) asks to robustly estimate the underlying low-dimensional subspace in the presence of outliers. Much recent work has been devoted for developing numerically efficient solutions of this problem. Current batch RSR formulations are at best comparable to full PCA (which computes all D eigenvectors). That is, their complexity is of order $\mathcal{O}(TND^2)$, where T is the number of iterations till convergence, N is the number of points and D is the ambient dimension. We are unaware of RSR batch algorithms that scale at least like $\mathcal{O}(TNDd)$, where d is the dimension of the approximated subspace.

To address this void, we propose the Fast Median Subspace (FMS) algorithm for RSR, whose computational cost is of order $\mathcal{O}(TNDd)$. Not only does it depend linearly on D (when d is small), but empirically FMS seems to obtain the smallest T and the highest accuracy among all other RSR algorithms (although Tyler M-estimator [28] is comparable in many cases). The underlying minimization of FMS is non-convex and thus it is difficult to analyze it. Nevertheless, we mention previous theoretical results that support strong robustness to outliers in very special cases. We also prove convergence of the energy function of the FMS iterates. While minimizers of convex relaxations of the same energy enjoy richer mathematical theory for

both robustness and convergence [16, 26, 29], they may falter in some practical cases not satisfying their theoretical model. We thus rely on careful numerical experimentation and believe that the results reported in this paper strongly indicate the merit of FMS in view of its competitive speed and accuracy. In particular, it seems to be the only suitable method for robust dimensionality reduction for the large astrophysics data that we analyze in §3.

1.1 Review of Related Work

PCA is by now a classic and ubiquitous method in data analysis [14]. Since it is obtained by the SVD of the data matrix, it enjoys a wealth of efficient numerical methods. In the last decade, various random methods have been proposed for fast and accurate computation of the top singular vectors and values (see the review in [12]). For example, Liberty et al. demonstrated an order of $\mathcal{O}(ND \log(d) + (N + D)d^2)$ randomized algorithm for d -approximation PCA [19]; and Rokhlin et al. [23] have combined random dimension reduction with the power method to obtain a PCA algorithm with $CNDd$ complexity (where C is a small constant) and with significantly improved accuracy when the singular values decay sufficiently fast. The complexity of state-of-the-art algorithms for online PCA [2, 3] is at best of order $\mathcal{O}(TDd)$; however, in practice T is often large and their accuracy is often not competitive.

While PCA is ubiquitous for subspace modeling without corruption, there is still not yet a clear choice for a best RSR algorithm. Many strategies for RSR have been established in the last three decades (see the review in [16] and some of the recent developments in [10, 11, 13, 16, 20, 25, 26, 28, 29]). Most of the emphasis of the theoretical analysis of RSR algorithms has been on quantifying the largest percentage of outliers under which the studied algorithm can be sufficiently accurate [13, 16, 26, 28, 29]. In particular, Hardt and Moitra [13] have shown that guaranteeing the success of an RSR algorithm with a fraction of outliers larger than $(D - d)/D$ for a broad range of instances is as hard as solving the small set expansion problem; they also showed that this fraction can be achieved in their setting; though it is possible to achieve a better fraction in special cases of their setting [16].

There are other robust algorithms that address completely different models of corruption. For example, [6] proposed element-wise corruption (within the data matrix). Furthermore, the HR-PCA algorithm of [25] may be competitive with a small amount of adversary outliers, but can fail with large percentages of outliers. On the other hand, some of the former RSR algorithms may be challenged by adversary outliers and thus often require initial data normalization to the unit sphere. In general, the right model for outliers is application-dependent and we thus emphasize the numerical experimentation.

Many of the successful RSR algorithms involve minimizing an energy, which is robust to outliers. For example, [11, 16, 20, 26, 29] use convex relaxations of the same energy, which is later formulated in (1) when $p = 1$ and $\delta = 0$. We believe that since FMS targets the original robust energy, and not convex relaxations of it, it achieves higher accuracy and possibly even faster convergence; however, its analysis is difficult due to the non-convexity. The Tyler M-estimator minimizes a more robust energy and thus obtains competitive accuracy (empirically, our method is as accurate as Tyler M-estimator). However, it cannot obtain sufficiently competitive speed since it requires full eigenvalue decomposition as well as initial dimensionality reduction by PCA at each iteration. The procedures of [13] do not involve robust energy minimization, but try to fit many different subspaces until success. They are not sufficiently fast and we are unfamiliar with truly competitive implementations of them. Online RSR algorithms [10, 11, 30] suffer from the same problems of online PCA algorithms mentioned above.

1.2 Notation

We assume a data set of N points in $\mathbb{R}^D$, $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^N$. We denote by $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times N}$ the data matrix whose columns are the data vectors. We seek an approximating d -dimensional subspace, L , or in short a d -subspace. We

denote by $G(D, d)$ the Grassmannian manifold of linear d -subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^D$. For $L \in G(D, d)$ we denote by P_L the orthogonal projector onto L , which we view as an element of $\mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$. Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^D$. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and $L \in G(D, d)$ we denote by $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, L)$ the Euclidean distance of $\mathbf{x}$ to L , that is, $\|\mathbf{x} - P_L \mathbf{x}\|$. The distance between $L_1, L_2 \in G(D, d)$, $\text{dist}(L_1, L_2)$, is the square-root of the sum of the squared principal angles between L_1 and L_2 .

1.3 Structure of The Paper

This paper begins by motivating and outlining our new algorithm in §2 as follows: §2.1 discusses the underlying minimization problem; §2.2 proposes the FMS algorithm as a heuristic minimizer for this problem; §2.3 establishes weak convergence of the energy function of the iterates of FMS; and §2.4 summarizes the complexity of FMS. Experiments on synthetic and real data (of astrophysics and face recognition) are done in §3 to demonstrate the usefulness of our new approach. Lastly, §4 concludes this work.

2 Fast and Robust Randomized PCA

We present the FMS algorithm. First, we describe its underlying minimization problem and its robustness. Next, we propose the FMS algorithm, while motivating it in a heuristic way. We then establish weak convergence. Last, we summarize its complexity.

2.1 The Underlying Minimization Problem

Many approaches for RSR are motivated by the following minimization problem: For the dataset $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^D$, $0 < p \leq 1$ and $\delta > 0$, find a d -subspace that minimizes among all such subspaces the energy

$$F(L) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L) \geq p\delta}} \text{dist}^p(\mathbf{x}_i, L) + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L) < p\delta}} \left(\frac{\text{dist}^2(\mathbf{x}_i, L)}{2\delta} + (p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta} \right). \quad (1)$$

This minimization was suggested with $p = 1$ and $\delta = 0$ by [21, 22, 24], who also proposed algorithmic solutions when $d = D - 1$. Later heuristic solutions were proposed for any $d < D$ by [8] and [30]. The regularization for the case $p = 1$ (with convex relaxations of the energy) was suggested in [16, 29]. We remark that the purpose of the last two constant terms of (1) is to guarantee continuity of F whenever $\text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L) = p\delta$ for some $i = 1, \dots, N$.

While the domain of this minimization is the set of all affine d -subspaces, experience shows that initial robust centering by the geometric median and then minimization over $G(D, d)$ is successful. We thus assume in our discussion that the data is centered (if not, we center it at the geometric median) and the domain of the minimization is $G(D, d)$.

On the surface, this is a rather natural robust minimization problem, which formally generalizes the notion of the geometric median to subspaces (see discussion in [29]). However, for $d > 0$ this minimization is not convex (since its domain, the Grassmannian, is not convex). Convex relaxations of it when $p = 1$ were introduced in [16, 20, 26, 29]. Nevertheless, for some real data their solutions are not satisfying (see §3.2). Furthermore, it is possible that direct approaches to the non-convex minimization, especially with $p < 1$, can yield even more robust solutions. At last, we are unaware of sufficiently fast implementations for such convex relaxations. We thus suggest here to revisit the original minimization problem while aiming to obtain a faster and more accurate algorithms for practical data.

Robustness of the abstract global minimizer of (1) when $\delta = 0$ is analyzed in [17, 18] under special assumptions on the data. In particular, [18] shows that for spherically symmetric inliers and outliers (possibly with additional less significant subspaces) asymptotic exact recovery is possible even when the fraction

of outliers approaches 100%. Furthermore, [16] implies that in the noiseless case (with outliers) its theory directly extends to the abstract global minimizer of (1) when $p = 1$ and $\delta = 0$. Nevertheless, it is important to be aware that in the presence of a single outlier with sufficiently large magnitude, the minimizer of (1) (or any of its convex relaxations) may fail to approximate the underlying subspace. Such a case (and its many variants) can be avoided by normalizing the centered data points according to their Euclidean norms so that they lie on the unit sphere (see more discussion in [16, 29]).

2.2 Proposed Solution to the Non-convex Minimization

We heuristically develop the FMS algorithm that iteratively computes subspaces $\{L_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset G(D, d)$. A more rigorous treatment and weak convergence guarantees for the resulting sequence follow from the proof of Proposition 1. Assume first that $\delta = 0$. Since $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^p = \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2 / \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^{2-p}$, we may try to iteratively minimize (1), where at iteration $k + 1$ we minimize the function

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2 / \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{2-p}. \quad (2)$$

The minimizer of (2) is easily obtained by weighted PCA and thus the whole procedure can be viewed as IRLS (iteratively re-weighted least squares). However, since the weight $1 / \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{2-p}$ may be undefined, we assume that $\delta > 0$ and modify the weight to be $1 / \max(\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{2-p}, p\delta)$ (a more rigorous explanation for this regularized term follows from the proof of Proposition 1). To solve the weighted PCA problem, one first needs to weigh the centered data points by the latter term and then apply PCA (without centering) to compute L_{k+1} . The ability to directly apply PCA, or equivalently SVD, to the scaled data matrix is numerically attractive, and we can apply any of the state-of-the-art suites for it.

Our procedure at iteration k is outlined as follows. First, weigh the data points of iteration k , $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$, by $\max(\text{dist}(\mathbf{y}_i, L_k)^{(2-p)/2}, \sqrt{p\delta})$, that is, form the new data points

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{y}_i / \max(\text{dist}(\mathbf{y}_i, L_k)^{(2-p)/2}, \sqrt{p\delta}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N. \quad (3)$$

Then, compute the top d right singular vectors of the scaled data matrix $\mathbf{Y}$, whose columns are the scaled data points $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ (For SVD, we found the randomized method of [23] to be the fastest). The subspace L_{k+1} , is the span of these vectors. This procedure is iterated until L_k sufficiently converges. We call this iterative procedure the Fast Median Subspace (FMS) and summarize it in Algorithm 1 (for simplicity we use the notation ϵ for $\sqrt{p\delta}$ used above).

Algorithm 1 Fast Median Subspace (FMS)

- 1: **Input:** $\mathbf{X}$: $D \times N$ centered data matrix, d : desired rank, p : robustness power ($0 < p < 1$; default: $p = 1$), n_m : maximum number of iterations, ϵ : regularization parameter (default: $\epsilon = 10^{-20}$)
 - 2: **Output:** L : d -subspace in $\mathbb{R}^D$
 - 3: $k \leftarrow 1$
 - 4: $L_0 \equiv L_1 \leftarrow$ random d -subspace in $\mathbb{R}^D$
 - 5: **while** $k < n_m$ and $\text{dist}(L_k, L_{k-1}) > 10^{-8}$ **do**
 - 6: $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}$
 - 7: **for** $i=1:N$ **do**
 - 8: $\mathbf{y}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_i / \max(\text{dist}(\mathbf{y}_i, L_k)^{(2-p)/2}, \epsilon)$
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: $[U, \mathbf{S}, V] \leftarrow \text{RandomizedSVD}(\mathbf{Y}, d)$ [23];
 - 11: $L_{k+1} \leftarrow$ column space of U
 - 12: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
 - 13: **end while**
-

In practice, we have found that the rate of convergence of the FMS algorithm is not affected by its particular use of RandomizedSVD [23]. In other words, if RandomizedSVD is replaced with the exact SVD, the convergence and accuracy are the same, but RandomizedSVD is faster. Also, it can be advantageous to initialize L_0 with the result of randomized PCA (or PCA) on the full dataset $\mathbf{X}$. Although this does not change the resulting subspace found by FMS, the algorithm seems to take one less iteration to converge.

2.3 Convergence of the Energy of the Iterates

We can verify the convergence of the sequence $F(L_k)$ in the following way (see proof in §A).

Proposition 1. *Let $\{L_k\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence obtained by applying FMS without stopping and let F be the function expressed in (1). Then $\{F(L_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges over $G(D, d)$.*

The problem of convergence of the iterates themselves is difficult. To guarantee such convergence to a local minimum it is desired to have local convexity (or local geodesic convexity); and to further guarantee local linear convergence it is desired to have strong local convexity [7]. Such conditions do not hold for our setting (even when $1 \leq p < 2$) and in the future we may try to establish them for very special cases of the RSR model.

2.4 Complexity

At each iteration, FMS creates a scaled data matrix of centered data points, which takes $\mathcal{O}(DNd)$ operations. It then finds the top d singular vectors of the scaled data matrix to update the subspace, which takes $\mathcal{O}(DNd)$. Thus, the total complexity is $\mathcal{O}(TDNd)$, where T is the number of iterations. Empirically, we have noticed that T can be treated as a relatively small constant. The storage of the FMS algorithm involves the $N \times D$ data matrix $\mathbf{X}$, and a scaled copy of $\mathbf{X}$ in $\mathbf{Y}$ at each iteration. FMS must also store the $N \times d$ bases for the subspaces L_k and L_{k+1} . Thus, the storage requirement for FMS is $2 \times N \times (D + d)$.

3 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we illustrate how the FMS algorithm performs on various synthetic and real data sets in a MATLAB test environment. It was most interesting for us to test FMS with the value of $p = 1$, in order to compare it with various convex relaxations of its energy in this case. FMS₁ denotes a case where the algorithm run with a value of $p = 1$. In several cases, we have not noticed a difference in the performance by choosing lower values of p and thus not reported them. In cases where we noted such a difference we report them with $p = 0.1$ and let FMS_{0.1} denote the case of $p = 0.1$. We set the parameter ϵ to be 10^{-10} .

The algorithms we compare with are the Tyler M-estimator [28], Median K-flats (MKF) [30], Reaper [16], R1-PCA [8], and Robust Online Mirror Descent (R-MD) [11]. We also tried a few other algorithms, in particular, HR-PCA [25], LLD [20], Outlier-Pursuit [26], and GMS [29], but they were not as competitive; we thus do not report their results. Even though, MKF and R-MD were not competitive either in many cases, it was important for us to compare with online algorithms. The comparison with R1-PCA was also important since its aims to directly minimize (1) when $p = 1$ and $\delta = 0$.

Tyler M-estimator is used with regularization parameter $\epsilon = 10^{-10}$. Median K-Flats passes over the data 10 times to find a single subspace of dimension d , with a step size of 0.01 and maximum number of iterations 1000. The Reaper algorithm is run with the regularization parameter $\delta = 10^{-20}$. R1-PCA uses stopping parameter 10^{-5} and is capped at 1000 iterations. R-MD passes over the data 10 times and uses step size $1/\sqrt{k}$ at iteration k .

3.1 Synthetic Experiments




Figure 1: Demonstration of recovery error and runtime on artificial instances for FMS and other competitive RSR algorithms. Fig. 1a and Fig. 1b demonstrate the accuracy and runtime versus percentage of outliers (bounded by the Hardt & Moitra’s upper bound for RSR; see [13]). In both measures, FMS shows state-of-the-art performance. Fig. 1c demonstrates runtime versus ambient dimension while the subspace dimension remains fixed at $d = 5$. The runtime of the FMS is superior to existing methods. Fig. 1d demonstrates recovery error versus the ratio of the variance between outliers and inliers.

A series of synthetic tests are run to determine how the FMS compares to other state-of-the-art algorithms. In all of these examples the data is sampled according to variants of the needle-haystack model of [16]. More precisely, inliers are sampled from a Gaussian distribution within a random linear d -subspace in $\mathbb{R}^D$, and outliers are sampled from a Gaussian distribution within the ambient space. Noise can be added to all points. In all of this experiments, the fraction of outliers is restricted by Hardt & Moitra’s upper bound for RCR, that is, $(D - d)/D$ [13] (this is a reasonable bound for RSR and when $d < D$ it is larger than the common 50% breakdown point for point estimation).

The first experiment demonstrates the effect of the percentage of outliers on the runtime and error of subspace recovery. Let Σ_{in} denote the orthogonal projector onto the randomly selected subspace, and let Σ_{out} denote the identity transformation on $\mathbb{R}^D$. In this experiment, inliers are drawn from the distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{in}/d)$ and outliers from the distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{out}/D)$. Scaling by $1/d$ and $1/D$ respectively ensures that both samples have comparable magnitudes. Error is measured by calculating the distance (defined

in §1.2) between the found and ground truth subspaces. The ambient dimension is fixed at $D = 100$, the subspace dimension is $d = 5$, and the total number of points is fixed at $N = 200$. Every data point is also perturbed by added noise drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 10^{-6}\Sigma_{out})$.

Figures 1a and 1b display results for error and runtime versus the percentage of outliers in a dataset. At each percentage value, the experiment is repeated on 20 randomly generated datasets and the results are then averaged. $FMS_{0.1}$ and Tyler M-estimator have the best performance on this data, while FMS_1 only demonstrates problems at high ends of outlier percentages. Out of the robust methods, FMS_1 is the fastest (excluding the high end of outlier percentage).

A second experiment is displayed in Figure 1c, where the runtime is plotted as a function of ambient dimension for different algorithms. Here we fix the total number of points at $N = 2000$ with 1000 inliers and 1000 outliers. The subspace dimension is fixed at $d = 5$, and the variance model for the sampled points is as before. Again, all points also have noise drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 10^{-6}\Sigma_{out})$. The ambient dimension is varied from 100 to 1000. The plotted runtime is averaged over 20 randomly generated datasets. Robust Online Mirror Descent is not shown in Figure 1c due to the very large runtime required for higher dimensions. For the datasets tested here, FMS_1 , Reaper, and Tyler M-estimator all precisely found the subspace for each ambient dimension. Among these, we note that FMS_1 has the best runtime at higher ambient dimension due to its lower complexity. Runtimes were calculated on a computer with 8 GB RAM and an Intel Core i5-2450M 2.50 GHz CPU. This figure demonstrates the benefits of lower complexity for the FMS algorithm. We remark that not only is FMS faster than Tyler M-estimator, it also does not require initial dimensionality reduction, which is required for Tyler M-estimator when applied for subspace recovery [28].

The final test on synthetic data displays the accuracy when the scale of the variance is different between the inliers and outliers. For this experiment, inliers are still drawn from the distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{in}/d)$. The outliers are drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, \lambda\Sigma_{out}/D)$, where λ is a scaling parameter used to change the variance. All points have noise drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 10^{-6}\Sigma_{out})$. The plot in Figure 1d displays the resulting error from various algorithms as the scaling parameter is changed. All points are the average error over 20 randomly generated datasets. FMS_1 and Tyler M-estimator both have perfect performance across scale.

The takeaway from these tests should be that the FMS algorithm offers state-of-the-art accuracy while having a complexity that leads to better runtimes in high dimensions.

3.2 Real Data Experiments

The first experiment demonstrating the usefulness of the FMS algorithm on real data comes from astronomy. A dataset is taken from the Sixth Data Release of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey [1]. 83686 spectra were taken from databases using code from [9]. Spectral reduction was performed to account for resampling, restframe shifting, and PCA gap correction [27]. The resulting data consisted of 83686 data points in dimension 3841. To use RSR on this dataset, we follow the example of previous work done with RSR for finding eigenspectra [5]. The data is first centered by subtracting the mean spectra from all values. The FMS_1 algorithm, the randomized PCA of [23] (which is used instead of PCA in order to significantly reduce the speed) and Tyler M-estimator are then applied to the data to find the top eigenspectra of the dataset. Other methods are not shown because they either do not do better than standard PCA, or because the methods take too long to be feasibly run due to the large size of the dataset. Budavári et al. [5] also provide criteria for determining what makes a resulting eigenspectra good. A key attribute of good eigenspectra is that they should not be noisy themselves. This would in turn introduce noise into the decomposition of individual galaxy spectra. Figure 2, shows the results from running FMS_1 , Tyler M-estimator, and PCA on the data. As we can see, parts of the eigenspectra in standard PCA are quite noisy, especially in the third, fourth, and fifth eigenspectra. Tyler M-estimator, although it converges in 3 iterations, makes no improvement on the eigenspectra found from standard PCA. The robustness of the FMS_1 algorithm allows it to find eigenspectra

that are not noisy while not sacrificing too much speed.




Figure 2: Flux vs. wavelength ($\text{\AA}$) for the top 5 eigenspectra found by FMS, randomized PCA, and Tyler M-estimator. FMS is the only one of these three algorithms to find eigenspectra that are not noisy.

The second experiment we run on real data is an example from image processing. The experiment shown here is the ‘Faces in a Crowd’ experiment outlined in [16]. This experiment is motivated by the fact that images of an individual’s face with fixed pose under varying lighting conditions should fall on a subspace of dimension at most 9 [4]. We draw a dataset of 64 cropped face images from the Extended Yale Face Database [15]. 32 of these face images are sampled to be the inliers of our dataset, and 400 outlier images are selected from the “BACKGROUND_Google” folder of the Caltech 101 database.

Experiments in [16] demonstrate the advantage of scaling each centered data point by its norm, i.e., by “spherizing” each data point (equivalently, projecting onto the unit sphere). This is also the case here, and we thus only report results of algorithms which apply such initial spherization (after centering by the geometric median) and denote them with additional “S-”. We remark that Tyler M-estimator implicitly spherizes the data. We fit a 9-dimensional subspace to the dataset using S-PCA, S-FMS₁, S-FMS_{0.1}, Tyler M-estimator, and S-Reaper. Pictures are downsampled to 20×20 and 30×30 in our two tests to show performance of the algorithms on images of different dimensions.

Figure 3a demonstrates the accuracy of the found subspaces in pictures of dimension 20×20 . For each subspace model, we project 4 images onto the subspace: one face from the inliers, one outlier point, and two out of sample faces. A better subspace should not distort the original image of the faces, and it is evident that the robust algorithms S-Reaper, Tyler, and both versions of FMS appear to work well on this data. However, the first test image appears to be better for FMS_{0.1}. Another comparison of the performance of these algorithms is given in Figure 3c. This graph displays the ordered distances for the 32 out of sample faces to the robust subspaces and against their ordered distances to the PCA subspace. The i th point for each algorithm corresponds to the i th closest distance to the robust subspace against the i th closest distance to the PCA subspace. In general, the closer faces are to the robust subspace the better. The algorithms all appear to offer robust approximations of the underlying subspace, but S-FMS_{0.1} seems to have a slight edge in the lower region.

Figures 3b and 3d demonstrate the same experiment, but on faces of dimension 30×30 . First we note that the S-Reaper algorithm cannot locate the robust subspace in this higher dimension. S-PCA and Tyler M-estimator also struggle in this scheme. However, S-FMS₁ does quite well at finding the face subspace. In




Figure 3: The faces in a crowd experiment for pictures downsampled to 20×20 and 30×30 dimensional pictures. Fig. 3a and Fig. 3c correspond to the experiment run on pictures downsampled to 20×20 , and Fig. 3b and Fig. 3d correspond to the experiment run on 30×30 dimensional pictures. On the top, we show projections of the pictures onto the subspaces found by each method. On the bottom, we show the ordered distances to RSR subspace against the distance to the PCA subspace. Lower distances to the robust subspace signify a greater degree of accuracy in locating the 9-dimensional subspace in the set with outliers.

fact, looking at Figure 3d, S-FMS₁ outperforms other algorithms by a significant degree.

4 Conclusions

We have proposed the FMS algorithm for fast robust recovery of a low-dimensional subspace in the presence of outliers. The algorithm aims to solve a non-convex minimization, which has been studied before. Recent

successful methods minimize convex relaxations of this problem. The main reason that we aimed to solve the non-convex problem was the ability of obtaining a truly fast algorithm for RSR. Indeed, the complexity of the FMS algorithm is of order $O(TNDd)$, where the number of required iterations T is empirically small. A side product of minimizing the non-convex problem is that its minimizer seems to be more robust to outliers than the minimizer of convex relaxations of the problem. Furthermore, it can include even non-convex energies (not just non-convex domain), which may yield even stronger robustness (one example is the use of the power $p < 1$ in our case).

The non-convexity of the minimization makes it hard to theoretically guarantee the success of FMS. We were only able to verify convergence of the energy function of the iterates $F(L_k)$. It was interesting to notice that in both synthetic and real data that reflect our model, we never had problems with global convergence of the iterates L_k . An interesting and nontrivial future project is to try to establish this observation in theory for some special cases. Nevertheless, in view of the strong experimental experience that we had, the FMS algorithm seems very promising as it is with high potential for robustly reducing dimension of corrupt and massive astrophysics data. We will make our implementation (including the randomized SVD implementation) available.

5 Acknowledgements

We thank Joshua Vogelstein for his recommendation of the astronomy data; Ching-Wa Yip for creating the astronomy dataset used in this paper; Tamás Budavári and David Lawlor for their help with processing and interpreting the astronomy data; Teng Zhang for useful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript and helpful discussions; and Nati Srebro for encouraging us to write up and submit our results.

References

- [1] J. K. Adelman-McCarthy et al. The sixth data release of the sloan digital sky survey. *Ast. J.*, 2008.
- [2] R. Arora, A. Cotter, K. Livescu, and N. Srebro. Stochastic optimization for PCA and PLS. In *Allerton*, 2012.
- [3] R. Arora, A. Cotter, and N. Srebro. Stochastic optimization of PCA with capped MSG. In *NIPS*, 2013.
- [4] R. Basri and D. Jacobs. Lambertian reflectance and linear subspaces. *TPAMI*, 25:218–233, 2003.
- [5] T. Budavri, V. Wild, A. S. Szalay, L. Dobos, and C.-W. Yip. Reliable eigenspectra for new generation surveys. *MNRAS*, 394(3):1496–1502, 2009.
- [6] E. J. Candès, X. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wright. Robust principal component analysis? *JACM*, 58:11, 2011.
- [7] T. F. Chan and P. Mulet. On the convergence of the lagged diffusivity fixed point method in total variation image restoration. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 36:354–367, 1999.
- [8] C. Ding, D. Zhou, X. He, and H. Zha. R1-PCA: rotational invariant L_1 -norm principal component analysis for robust subspace factorization. In *ICML*, pages 281–288, 2006.
- [9] L. Dobos, T. Budavári, I. Csabai, and A. S. Szalay. Spectrum Services 2007. In *Astronomical Spectroscopy and Virtual Observatory*, page 79, 2008.
- [10] J. Feng, H. Xu, and S. Yan. Robust PCA in high-dimension: A deterministic approach. *ICML*, 2012.

- [11] J. Goes, T. Zhang, R. Arora, and G. Lerman. Robust stochastic principal component analysis. *JMLR W&CP*, page 266274, 2014.
- [12] N. Halko, P-G. Martinsson, and J. A. Tropp. Finding structure with randomness: Probabilistic algorithms for constructing approximate matrix decompositions. *SIAM Review*, 53(2):217–288, 2011.
- [13] M. Hardt and A. Moitra. Algorithms and hardness for robust subspace recovery. In *COLT*, 2013.
- [14] I. T. Jolliffe. *Principal Component Analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, 2002.
- [15] K.-C. Lee, J. Ho, and D. Kriegman. Acquiring linear subspaces for face recognition under variable lighting. *IEEE TPAMI*, 27(5):684–698, 2005.
- [16] G. Lerman, M. McCoy, J. A. Tropp, and T. Zhang. Robust computation of linear models, or how to find a needle in a haystack. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2012.
- [17] G. Lerman and T. Zhang. ℓ_p -Recovery of the Most Significant Subspace among Multiple Subspaces with Outliers. *ArXiv e-prints*, December 2010.
- [18] G. Lerman and T. Zhang. Robust recovery of multiple subspaces by geometric l_p minimization. *Ann. Statist.*, 39(5):2686–2715, 2011.
- [19] E. Liberty, F. Woolfe, P-G. Martinsson, V. Rokhlin, and M. Tygert. Randomized algorithms for the low-rank approximation of matrices. *PNAS*, 104(51):20167–20172, 2007.
- [20] M. McCoy and J. Tropp. Two proposals for robust PCA using semidefinite programming. *Elec. J. Stat.*, 5:1123–1160, 2011.
- [21] H. Nyquist. Least orthogonal absolute deviations. *CSDA*, 6(4):361 – 367, 1988.
- [22] M. R. Osborne and G. A. Watson. An analysis of the total approximation problem in separable norms, and an algorithm for the total l_1 problem. *SISC*, 6(2):410–424, 1985.
- [23] V. Rokhlin, A. Szlam, and M. Tygert. A randomized algorithm for principal component analysis. *SIMAX*, 2009.
- [24] H. Späth and G. A. Watson. On orthogonal linear approximation. *Num. Mat.*, 51:531–543, 1987.
- [25] H. Xu, C. Caramanis, and S. Mannor. Principal component analysis with contaminated data: The high dimensional case. In *COLT*, pages 490–502, 2010.
- [26] H. Xu, C. Caramanis, and S. Sanghavi. Robust PCA via outlier pursuit. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 58(5):3047–3064, 2012.
- [27] C. W. Yip et al. Distributions of galaxy spectral types in the sloan digital sky survey. *Ast. J.*, 2004.
- [28] T. Zhang. Robust subspace recovery by geodesically convex optimization. *ArXiv*, 2012.
- [29] T. Zhang and G. Lerman. A novel m-estimator for robust PCA. *JMLR*, 15:749–808, 2014.
- [30] T. Zhang, A. Szlam, and G. Lerman. Median K -flats for hybrid linear modeling with many outliers. In *ICCV Workshops*, pages 234–241, 2009.

A Proof of Proposition 1

We define the following auxiliary energy function H :

$$\begin{aligned}
H(L, L_0) = & \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0) \geq p\delta}} \left(\frac{p}{2} \frac{\text{dist}^2(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2}{\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0)^{2-p}} + \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right) \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0)^p \right) \\
& + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0) < p\delta}} \left(\frac{\text{dist}^2(\mathbf{x}_i, L)}{2\delta} + (p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta} \right). \tag{4}
\end{aligned}$$

This function satisfies the following two lemmata that immediately imply the proof of Proposition 1:

Lemma 1. *The function H majorizes the function F (defined in (1)) as follows:*

$$F(L) \leq H(L, L_0) \quad \forall L, L_0 \in G(D, d); \tag{5}$$

$$F(L_0) = H(L_0, L_0) \quad \forall L_0 \in G(D, d). \tag{6}$$

Lemma 2. *Assume that $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L_k \in G(D, d)$. For each data point $\mathbf{x}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, let $\mathbf{y}_i := \mathbf{x}_i / \max(\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{(2-p)/2}, \sqrt{p\delta})$. Then,*

$$\argmin_{L \in G(D, d)} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{dist}^2(\mathbf{y}_i, L) = \argmin_{L \in G(D, d)} H(L, L_k). \tag{7}$$

We prove Lemmata 1 and 2 in §A.1 and §A.2 respectively. Applying these lemmata, we conclude Proposition 1 as follows. We recall that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, L_{k+1} is obtained by PCA of the scaled data points $\{\mathbf{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ (at iteration k). That is,

$$L_{k+1} = \argmin_{L \in G(D, d)} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{dist}(\mathbf{y}_i, L)^2 \tag{8}$$

It thus follows from (7) that

$$L_{k+1} = \argmin_{L \in G(D, d)} H(L, L_k). \tag{9}$$

Finally, (5), (6) and (9) imply that

$$F(L_{k+1}) \leq H(L_{k+1}, L_k) \leq H(L_k, L_k) = F(L_k). \tag{10}$$

Thus the sequence $F(L_k)$ forms a monotonically decreasing sequence that is bounded below by 0, and so it must converge to a point in $\mathbb{R}$. $\square$

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

We first note that (6) easily follows by direct evaluation of $H(L_0, L_0)$ and $F(L_0)$. To establish (5), we will examine H and F term by term. Let

$$H(\mathbf{x}_i, L, L_0) = \begin{cases} \frac{p}{2} \frac{\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2}{\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0)^{2-p}} + (1 - \frac{p}{2}) \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0)^p, & \text{if } \text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0) \geq p\delta; \\ \frac{\text{dist}^2(\mathbf{x}_i, L)}{2\delta} + (p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta}, & \text{if } \text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0) < p\delta. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

$$F(\mathbf{x}_i, L) = \begin{cases} \text{dist}^p(\mathbf{x}_i, L), & \text{if } \text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0) \geq p\delta; \\ \frac{\text{dist}^2(\mathbf{x}_i, L)}{2\delta} + (p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta}, & \text{if } \text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0) < p\delta. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

We will show that

$$H(\mathbf{x}_i, L, L_0) \geq F(\mathbf{x}_i, L) \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{X}, L, L_0 \in G(D, d) \quad (13)$$

and thus conclude (5). We arbitrarily fix $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{X}$ and $L_0 \in G(D, d)$ and prove the desired inequality in different cases.

If $\text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0) < p\delta$, then $F(\mathbf{x}_i, L) = H(\mathbf{x}_i, L, L_0) \quad \forall L \in G(D, d)$, so that (13) is an equality.

Assume on the other hand that $\text{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0) \geq p\delta$. For simplicity of notation, let us denote $\alpha = \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)$ and $\alpha_0 = \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_0)$. In view of (11) and (12), in order to prove (13) in this case, we need to show that if $\alpha_0^{2-p} \geq p\delta$, then

$$\frac{p\alpha_0^{p-2}}{2} \alpha^2 + (1 - \frac{p}{2}) \alpha_0^p \geq \alpha^p, \quad \text{if } \alpha \geq p\delta; \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{p\alpha_0^{p-2}}{2} \alpha^2 + (1 - \frac{p}{2}) \alpha_0^p \geq \frac{\alpha^2}{2\delta} + (p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta}, \quad \text{if } \alpha < p\delta. \quad (15)$$

To prove (14), we consider the function $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$f(z) = \frac{p\alpha_0^{p-2}}{2} z^{2/p} - z + (1 - \frac{p}{2}) \alpha_0^p. \quad (16)$$

We note that f is convex, $f(\alpha_0^p) = 0$, and $f'(\alpha_0^p) = 0$. Thus,

$$f(z) \geq 0 \quad \forall z \geq 0, \quad (17)$$

in particular $f(\alpha^p) \geq 0$, and (14) is proved (in fact for any $\alpha, \alpha_0 > 0$).

To prove (15), we consider the function $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$h(z) = \frac{p\alpha_0^{p-2}}{2} z^2 - \frac{z^2}{2\delta} + (1 - \frac{p}{2}) \alpha_0^p - \left((p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta} \right). \quad (18)$$

The function $h(z)$ is a parabola with vertex at $z = 0$ and it opens down since $\alpha_0^{2-p} \geq p\delta$. Thus the infimum of $h(z)$ in the interval $\{z : z^{2-p} < p\delta, z \geq 0\}$ is $h(z^*)$, where $z^* = (p\delta)^{1/(2-p)}$. It suffices to show that $h(z^*) \geq 0$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{p\alpha_0^{p-2}}{2}(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta} + \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right)\alpha_0^p - \left((p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta}\right) \\ &= \frac{p\alpha_0^{p-2}}{2}(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)} + \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right)\alpha_0^p - (p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We notice that (19) is equivalent to $f((p\delta)^{p/(2-p)}) \geq 0$, which follows from (17). Therefore, (15) is proved and consequently (13) and the lemma are concluded. $\square$

A.2 Proof of Lemma 2

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmin}_{L \in G(D,d)} \sum_{i=1}^N \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{y}_i, L)^2 = \operatorname{argmin}_{L \in G(D,d)} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{P}_L \mathbf{y}_i\|^2 \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{L \in G(D,d)} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \frac{\mathbf{x}_i}{\max(\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{(2-p)/2}, \sqrt{p\delta})} - \mathbf{P}_L \frac{\mathbf{x}_i}{\max(\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{(2-p)/2}, \sqrt{p\delta})} \right\|^2 \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{L \in G(D,d)} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\max(\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{2-p}, p\delta)} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{P}_L \mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{L \in G(D,d)} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \operatorname{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k) \geq p\delta}} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2}{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{2-p}} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \operatorname{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k) < p\delta}} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2}{p\delta} \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{L \in G(D,d)} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \operatorname{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k) \geq p\delta}} \frac{p}{2} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2}{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{2-p}} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \operatorname{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k) < p\delta}} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2}{2\delta} \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{L \in G(D,d)} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \operatorname{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k) \geq p\delta}} \left(\frac{p}{2} \frac{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2}{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^{2-p}} + \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right) \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k)^p \right) + \\ & \quad \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq N \\ \operatorname{dist}^{2-p}(\mathbf{x}_i, L_k) < p\delta}} \left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i, L)^2}{2\delta} + (p\delta)^{p/(2-p)} - \frac{(p\delta)^{2/(2-p)}}{2\delta} \right) \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{L \in G(D,d)} H(L, L_k). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

B Appendix: Convergence Demonstration

We present graphs illustrating the convergence of the FMS algorithm (compared to other RSR iterative algorithms) for some of the synthetic and real data explored in §3. In the synthetic tests, we show both error versus time and error versus iteration to give an idea of how the algorithm converges in time and iteration. We also try to show how the choice of initialization (PCA or completely random) for the FMS algorithm affects the convergence. Whenever FMS is initialized by PCA, we write FMS (PCA-init.) and whenever

FMS is initialized by a random subspace we write FMS (Ran-init.). For FMS (PCA-init.) we initialize by RandomizedSVD, but as we mentioned earlier we found no difference in accuracy and rate of convergence (only in speed) when applying instead standard SVD. Finally, we also give an idea of the convergence for the algorithms we tested in the Faces in a Crowd experiment. Convergence graphs for the astronomy data test in our paper cannot be given because we do not know beforehand which data points are inliers and which are outliers. Thus, we cannot find a ground truth subspace in this example.

We first display results from synthetic tests. We follow the needle-haystack model described in §3.1. We recall that Σ_{in} denotes the orthogonal projector onto the randomly selected subspace, and Σ_{out} denotes the identity transformation on $\mathbb{R}^D$. Inliers are drawn from the distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{in}/d)$ and outliers from the distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{out}/D)$. Error is measured by finding the output subspace given by each algorithm and calculating the distance (defined in §1.2) between the found and ground truth subspaces. The ambient dimension is fixed at $D = 500$, the subspace dimension is $d = 5$, and the total number of points is $N = 1000$ with 500 inliers and 500 outliers. The dataset also has every data point corrupted by noise drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, 10^{-6}\Sigma_{out})$.




Figure 4: Convergence of the FMS algorithm compared to GMS, Reaper, and Tyler M-estimator. Data is generated by the needle-haystack model with $D = 500$, $d = 5$, $N_{in} = 500$, $N_{out} = 500$, and added Gaussian noise of variance 10^{-6} . 15 iterations of each algorithm are run.




Figure 5: Convergence of the FMS algorithm compared to GMS, Reaper, and Tyler M-estimator. FMS (Ran-init.) is FMS initialized with a completely random subspace, and FMS (PCA-init.) is FMS with PCA initialization. Data is generated by the needle-haystack model with $D = 500$, $d = 5$, $N_{in} = 500$, $N_{out} = 500$, and added Gaussian noise of variance 10^{-6} . 15 iterations of each algorithm are run.




Figure 6: Convergence of the FMS algorithm compared to GMS, Reaper, and Tyler M-estimator. FMS (Ran-init.) is FMS initialized with a completely random subspace, and FMS (PCA-init.) is FMS with PCA initialization. Data is generated by the needle-haystack model with $D = 500$, $d = 5$, $N_{in} = 500$, $N_{out} = 500$, this time with no added noise. 15 iterations of each algorithm are run.




Figure 7: Convergence of the FMS algorithm compared to GMS, Reaper, and Tyler M-estimator. FMS (Ran-init.) is FMS initialized with a completely random subspace, and FMS (PCA-init.) is FMS with PCA initialization. Data is generated by the needle-haystack model with $D = 500$, $d = 5$, $N_{in} = 500$, $N_{out} = 500$, this time with no added noise. 15 iterations of each algorithm are run.




Figure 8: Convergence comparison of the S-FMS_{0.1}, S-FMS₁, Reaper, and Tyler M-estimator on the faces in a crowd experiment performed on the 20×20 dimensional pictures.




Figure 9: Convergence comparison of the S-FMS₁, Reaper, and Tyler M-estimator on the faces in a crowd experiment performed on the 30×30 dimensional pictures.